

JULY 3, 1951
671st BROADCAST

Town Meeting

Illinois U Library

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 275 Stations of the ABC Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Is Our Security Endangered by Congressional Hearings?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

RUSSELL B. LONG

O. K. ARMSTRONG

Interrogators

HOUSTON COLE

WALTER J. MERRILL



THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

on

"Is the West Finished in Asia?"

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 17, NUMBER 10



\$5.00 A YEAR; 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 17 No. 10



Is Our Security Endangered by Congressional Hearings?

The Broadcast of July 3, 1951, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., EDT, over the American Broadcasting Company Network, originated from Leone Cole Auditorium, Jacksonville, Alabama, under the auspices of the *Anniston Star*, Station WHMA, and Jacksonville State College.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG—Democrat of Louisiana; Member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. After a brief period of law practice in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Senator Long, a graduate of Louisiana State University Law School, entered the United States Navy and was eventually commissioned and placed in command of an LCT. He practiced in various Mediterranean invasions, including Anzio and southern France. Following his discharge from the Navy, he re-entered law practice in Baton Rouge, becoming executive counsel to the Governor of Louisiana in May, 1948. The youngest member of the Senate, Senator Long did not become constitutionally eligible to serve, because of his age, until the day following the 1948 election. He was re-elected to Congress on November 7, 1950.

REPRESENTATIVE O. K. ARMSTRONG—Republican of Missouri; Member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee; recently returned from Korea. After receiving his B.S. and M.A. degrees in journalism at the University of Missouri, Representative Armstrong taught for a short time at the University of Florida. For ten years, he was chairman of Child Welfare for the Missouri Department of the American Legion, and for nine years he served as a member of the National Child Welfare Committee. He has been a member of the Missouri Legislature during 1932-36 and 1944-46, and was elected Representative to the 82nd Congress on November 7, 1950. Representative Armstrong recently spent three weeks in Japan, Korea, and Formosa, where he talked with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and General Douglas MacArthur. Author of several books and numerous articles, he has been a staff writer for the *Reader's Digest* since 1944.

Interrogators

DR. HOUSTON COLE—President of Jacksonville State College.

WALTER J. MERRILL—Anniston Attorney.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 18, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year. (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1951, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

Is Our Security Endangered by Congressional Hearings?

Announcer:

Tonight we greet you from central Alabama, the heart of the deep South, where we are the guests of Jacksonville State College and our local sponsor, the *Anniston Star*.

Anniston was one of the first model cities in America and was founded about seventy years ago by Confederate General Sam Noble and Union General Daniel Tyler. It is a center of the cast iron pipe industry and a large number of textile and other industries. The General Electric Company has just announced plans for a six-million-dollar electronic tube plant just south of this city.

Jacksonville State College, founded in 1883, has experienced its greatest growth and development under the leadership of its present President, Dr. Houston Cole, who is participating in our program this evening which is originating in the Leone Cole Auditorium. Nearby is International House, where these students learn the meaning of world citizenship.

Now, to preside over tonight's discussion, here is your moderator, the President of Town Hall and founder of America's Town Meeting, George V. Denny, Jr.

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. I think it was Mr. Walter Lippmann who said, during the MacArthur investigations, that this was the first time a great nation had ever held a council of war in public. Congressional hearings have grown in prominence in recent years, but none has attracted such world-wide attention as the inquiry on General

MacArthur's dismissal, the official transcript of which took more than two million words — more than three times the number of words in the Bible.

The important thing for us to consider tonight is: Was this or similar investigations in the highest interest of our national security? To what extent is Congress and to what extent are the American people entitled to such detailed information which may or may not be of pertinent value to our real or potential enemies?

To help us consider this question we are to hear from Senator Russell Long, Democrat, of Louisiana, and Congressman O. K. Armstrong, Republican, of Missouri. They will be questioned by Dr. Houston Cole, President of Jacksonville State College, and Walter J. Merrill, Anniston attorney.

Senator Russell Long's peculiar qualification for tonight's discussion is the fact that he is a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and sat through the recent Senate investigation on the cause for the dismissal of General MacArthur. Senator Long was born in Shreveport, Louisiana, is a graduate of the State University and its Law School, saw service in the United States Navy as a Commander of an LCT boat. He is the youngest member of the Senate and did not become eligible to serve until the day following his 1948 election.

We are happy to present on Town Meeting, Senator Russell Long.

Senator Long:

Mr. Denny, friends of Jacksonville State College, ladies and

gentlemen. Ordinarily, I would be the first to advocate open congressional hearings as the best method of getting the facts to the American people. Yet, when we investigate the conduct of our military operations or our delicate diplomatic negotiations during a time of war, we necessarily jeopardize our national security.

The MacArthur hearings serve to illustrate our problem. The American people demanded to know why General MacArthur's recommendations had not been followed. Yet, they did not want to satisfy their curiosity at the expense of the lives of our men who were fighting in Korea.

The Republicans voted for open hearings and the Democrats voted to hold the hearings behind closed doors. The Democrats prevailed.

Now that the hearings are over, I believe we did a good job of getting the facts to the American people. At the same time, we withheld most of the secret information that an enemy would like to have when he is planning to destroy us. We also withheld a considerable amount of testimony that would have assisted the Russians in their campaign to separate us from our allies. Here is how we did it:

As each witness testified, we would change reporters every ten minutes. The reporters would quickly take down the testimony, transcribe it and work in relays with others.

Then a small group of security specialists, headed by Vice Admiral Davis, would check the transcript for security purposes, taking out the details that our enemies especially wanted.

Within one-half hour of the time a witness started talking, his first words were being released to the entire world. The Committee would

review the material which had been taken from the record, and if the Committee thought there was not sufficient reason to withhold the information, it was then released. Upon the request of our Committee, large numbers of documents, which had previously been classified as top secret, secret, and confidential, were released to the public.

Mind you, Congressman Armstrong, these were closed hearings, and yet in spite of that, our enemies gained much helpful information. This was unavoidable if the American people were to have the sufficient facts to understand the full picture.

Our enemies learned that we were not bombing the supply depot at Rashin and that we did not intend to bomb it, thus, enabling them to use this depot without fear that it would be bombed.

China learned that we were not bombing Manchuria because we were hoping to thus avoid war with Russia. This had a tendency to drive China farther into the Russian camp when we should have been trying to separate her from Russia.

The Russians learned the reasons that we were shooting down more of their jet planes than we were losing. We also informed the Russians that they had perfected better jet engines than we yet possessed.

In many respects, we gave the Soviet our best estimate of their war capacity and their intentions—not from the lips of irresponsible commentators, but from the highest officials of this government.

Stalin undoubtedly read every word. But Congressman Armstrong, we did not tell Stalin what preparations we had made to meet his aggression if the Russians

entered the war. We did not tell Mao Tse-tung where we were holding our air reserve units nor the number of planes nor the types of planes we were holding in readiness to meet a possible onslaught by enemy air power. We did not give our enemies the satisfaction of knowing for sure whether we had accurately estimated the reserves that we were holding and that we thought they were holding in their Manchurian and Siberian sanctuaries.

The public obtained all the facts necessary to an enlightened understanding of the problems. The public read almost 98 per cent of the testimony without running the risk of permitting our enemies to obtain a great number of details that they were seeking. On hundreds of occasions, I can recall the old saying "curiosity killed the cat." May God forbid that idle curiosity of the American people should force us to give our enemies the information they need to destroy us. (*Applause*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Long. The name O. K. Armstrong is well known to readers of the *Reader's Digest*, is well known to American Legionnaires, and now is extremely well known in the Congress of the United States. He is a Missouri Republican who was elected in the last election, is a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and did the unusual stunt of making a junket to Korea at his own expense. We are happy to present on Town Meeting Congressman O. K. Armstrong.

Congressman Armstrong:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Denny, and friends of the Town Meeting of the Air, it is good to be here in the home community of that out-

standing Congressman Ken Roberts of Alabama.

In this friendly discussion with my distinguished colleague, Senator Long of Louisiana, let my first statement be this: Thank God for open congressional hearings. Our security is never endangered by them, for they bring out the truth, and as a Great Teacher has said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Let me state emphatically that I believe the American people are entitled to all information available from every department of the federal government relating to foreign policies and military plans.

The gentleman in the audience a moment ago asked me what I would keep secret. I answer: only that information which if known would be useful to a potential aggressor.

Congressional hearings are in the best democratic traditions of a free people. They demonstrate that our public officials are servants of the people, and not their masters. The government exists for the people—a fact our foreign policy makers seem easily to forget. The American people are directly affected, in their personal, family, and community lives, by every move made in our relations to other peoples and governments.

The people must pay for the mistakes of those policies, as witness the huge cost of the mistakes made by this Administration and its predecessor at the conferences at Teheran, at Yalta, at Potsdam, and other meetings where our foreign policies were worked out in secret, without the knowledge and consent of the Congress or the people.

Today we are paying with the blood of our boys, and with our resources, for foreign policies

which, if they had been proposed in open congressional hearings, would have been rejected overwhelmingly by outraged public opinion of the American people.

I have but to cite the secret agreements that divided Germany, Austria, and Korea, betrayed China into the hands of the Reds, gave Soviet Russia the green light which has resulted in her murderous tyrants taking over one-fourth the area of the world and dominating almost 800,000,000 people.

Recently our Senate Committee conducting open hearings on the firing of General MacArthur by President Truman raised the question of our security. Our security was not endangered by those hearings. Senator Long mentions that we let the Russians know why we did not bomb certain areas, such as Rashin and Manchuria. Well, the Russians knew that already. They knew that our State Department wanted to appease Great Britain and other allies who hope to keep up their lucrative trade with Red China at a time when Reds were killing our boys in Korea.

Senator Long said we let the Russians know why we were shooting down more of their planes than they of ours. Well, the Russians knew that already.

Rather, these MacArthur hearings strengthened our security, for they brought out the truth as to our danger from secret policies of appeasement and weakness. They have awakened a determination to stand up more firmly to the threats of aggression from a regime headed by a dictator which President Truman once characterized as "Good Old Joe, he's a decent fellow," and later, "He is worse than Hitler."

The hearings have shown in

vivid relief the danger we face from snap judgments and decisions in foreign affairs, such as the decision to send our military forces into war with no consultation with Congress whatever; the decision to fire General MacArthur without showing him the decent courtesy of a conference to discuss differences; and the ghastly futility of launching a war in Korea which our leaders apparently do not intend to win anyhow.

Other great benefits have resulted from recent congressional hearings. The American people have been made more critical of our policies, and our policy makers. The facts brought out tend to refute Soviet propaganda. Members of Congress themselves, I can assure you, have been given information needed for wise legislation. And the whole American people have been put on notice that foreign affairs is their business—the business of every patriotic citizen. *(Applause)*

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Armstrong, and congratulations to both you gentlemen members of Congress for staying within your time limits, strictly.

Now we are ready for a couple of questions from our two interrogators, Dr. Houston Cole, President of Jacksonville State College, and Mr. Walter J. Merrill, distinguished Anniston attorney. Dr. Cole, are you ready with your question?

Dr. Cole: Congressman Armstrong, I'd like to ask this question of you, sir. The committees investigating the MacArthur case recently issued what it called a declaration of faith and which served notice on Russia, at least endeavored to, that we were not

disunited in this country as related to that enemy. It seems to me that the Committee felt that if it hadn't conveyed valuable information to the enemy, it would not have seen fit to issue that. I'd like to know why, in your opinion, this declaration of faith was issued.

Congressman Armstrong: Well, Dr. Cole, I agreed very heartily with the words of Senator Russell of Georgia in that declaration of faith. I think he expressed the sentiments not only of members of Congress, but of the American people generally. I do not believe the statement was made to indicate in any way that we had given information that would be of value to the enemy.

Mr. Merrill: Senator Long, how can the people of this country find out what our foreign policy is and why it is, if we do not have congressional hearings to make them public?

Senator Long: I would like to have it understood that I personally very much believe in the MacArthur hearings that we have just conducted. Those were closed hearings. We did not take the chance that words might slip out to tell our enemies what our latest developments were in the field of atomic research. We did not take the chance in those hearings of through inadvertence having some of our witnesses saying things that the Russians wanted to know, telling how many aircraft we had at certain places, and things of that sort, telling what we expected the enemy might do, and what we would expect to do to counter it. I believe we should have had that investigation. I've always thought so, but I thought the way we did it, behind closed doors, looking over the testimony before we

made it public to our enemies and to the public at large, was a wiser way to proceed with it.

Dr. Cole: Congressman Armstrong, before this committee investigated General MacArthur, General Wedemeyer advocated that we establish air bases surrounding Russia's economic potential. Could that not be used by the Politburo as grist for the propaganda mill?

Congressman Armstrong: Well, Dr. Cole, I think that it would be used as grist for the propaganda mill of the Kremlin, but I'd like to remind you that the Kremlin has no regard for the truth, and they are going to use anything, whether we say it or not, as grist for their mill. Personally, I think we ought to work up some grist ourselves. I think we ought to throw some propaganda right back at them, and let it be the truth. (*Applause*)

Dr. Cole: I have a question here. If you'll answer it, Congressman, yes or no, we'll resolve this whole question. Would you say the Politburo enjoyed the MacArthur hearings, or were they a displeasure to that organization?

Congressman Armstrong: I think the Politburo enjoyed the firing of General MacArthur much more than they did the hearings.

Mr. Merrill: A question for Senator Long. When the Foreign Office of our allies furnishes us with Russian agents to work on our atom bomb projects, and with diplomats who go back and presumably vanish behind the Iron Curtain, why tell our allies things you're not willing to tell the American people?

Senator Long: In some respects, you have to trust your allies, particularly when you are dealing at the highest level. When our President is dealing with their Prime Ministers, there has to be

some trust, explaining to one another what the problems are, that you can't make available either to all the American people or to all the British people. You have to do the best you can under those circumstances.

Mr. Merrill: One further question please. Isn't the danger of suspicion and distrust on the part of the American people resulting from secret policies and trades more dangerous to us than the information our enemies can get from public hearings on these policies?

Senator Long: I don't agree with that. I do not agree with the Yalta or Potsdam Conferences, but I would point out to you that the main difficulties with those agreements were not what they contained, but the fact that Russia didn't keep their end of the bargain. Russia agreed to a free Poland, a free Czechoslovakia, a free Bulgaria, and a free Hungary. She broke her word on all occasions. If she had kept her word in those agreements, those agreements wouldn't have been near as bad as they appeared after she broke her word.

Congressman Armstrong: Well, I just wanted to agree with Senator Long on that. Russia never kept her word on that. She has never kept her word to us or any other decent free-loving people, and she won't keep her word on this cease-fire, either.

Dr. Cole: Congressman Armstrong, I'd like to ask you two questions, sir. Would you agree that the primary purpose of congressional committees would be to inform the Congress, inform the public, and to secure data for legislation? Would you agree with that?

Congressman Armstrong: Yes, sir, I would, Dr. Cole.

Dr. Cole: According to the Gallup Poll last Sunday, 53 per cent of the people in the United States who were polled said the congressional hearings involving MacArthur were a waste of time and were largely political. Well, it didn't serve its purpose there. It was there to inform the public. The public apparently didn't accept it. In the second place, I don't know of any single congressman who changed his mind as a result of the hearings, and according to Senator Russell, the chairman, no legislation will come as a result of the hearing. Therefore, what good did that hearing do?

Congressman Armstrong: Well, that's a pretty big question. Remember that the minds of Congressmen are pretty hard to change. On this particular thing, however, whether legislation comes out of it or not, certainly our State Department under the pressure of public opinion is already changing many of its policies. Now, as to whether the time was wasted, or whether it was political, I think whenever great committees such as this one that included Senator Long, our distinguished guest here tonight, and the other distinguished members of that committee, whenever they bring out facts before the American people on any subject, it is well worth while.

As to whether or not it was political, there may have been some politics in it. Personally, I felt that the Chiefs of Staff and the Generals who appeared before that committee were pretty well briefed and I know they weren't briefed by the Republican party.

Mr. Denny: Senator Long, do you have a comment on that?

Senator Long: I would like to

make this statement. I believe that in those hearings we did gain a substantial benefit. I do think that we jeopardized our security in some respects. It would have been jeopardized much more if those hearings had been held in the open, but we did gain substantial coöperation from our allies as a result of those hearings in making them cooperate in an economic blockade on China, for one thing, and in coöperating with us better in our Korean effort. The hearings did help to do that.

Mr. Merrill: A question for Congressman Armstrong. Do you feel it better to reveal the details of our public policy openly, instead of having the details of our foreign policy released through Drew Pearson, or some other columnist, and slanted as he wishes it?

Congressman Armstrong: Well, I've been a columnist of small parts myself, and I think you're exactly right, Mr. Merrill. I think it ought to be revealed in the proper way and, may I say, in a truthful way.

Dr. Cole: Senator Long, would you say that the average Congressman is a good security risk?

Senator Long: Some are not. It's unfortunately true that some of this information does leak. I've seen situations of that sort. In fact, I've had the experience myself of sitting in on a congressional hearing, seeing information marked top secret for obvious reasons, and later on hearing someone spill that information on the floor of the Senate. We have to take those risks and that's the part of the chance we take in our democracy.

Mr. Merrill: I have one more for Congressman Armstrong. I'll ask you whether or not you believe that the Administration today

opposes open hearings on its foreign policy because it has no foreign policy?

Congressman Armstrong: That question was a little bit loaded. May I say that I hope that the Administration will try to work out a better, may I say, a bi-partisan policy? I'm one Republican that thinks it would be better for the whole country if the President would bring in responsible spokesmen for both parties and revive a genuine bi-partisan consultation in this country. (*Applause*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator Long has a comment there.

Senator Long: I agree with the need for a bi-partisan foreign policy, and though we are wandering a little far from the field, I believe we should recognize that a lot has been accomplished. We encouraged Turkey and Greece to stand up against Russia. They are strong allies of ours today, and they are friends—a bulwark in the path of Russian expansion. Because of the foreign policy that this administration pursued, we still have Europe on our side, and there are some of us who never expected Europe to last that long, and they are stronger today than they have ever been. The communists have less strength in every one of those European countries than they had a few years ago when this Administration, with the help of some of the Republicans, began to work to try to build a policy to help resist communist aggression. (*Applause*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Long. Now this wonderfully representative audience here is just full of people who have questions, and the aisles are filled. I'm going to start with the gentleman down here on the right.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Man: Senator Long, wouldn't an extra congressional tribunal, possibly including members of the Judiciary, make a more objective investigation and report, and, may I add, results?

Senator Long: Insofar as foreign policy is concerned, I don't think so. One great difficulty you have on foreign policy is that most people don't have the chance to keep up with it. If they did make a study of it, they'd know a lot more about our policy and what we're doing and what has been accomplished to try to resist communist aggression than persons who have no occasion to make a particular study or keep up with it from day to day.

Lady: Congressman Armstrong, do you really think that public opinion can outweigh pressure groups in forming foreign policy?

Congressman Armstrong: Yes, I think it can if it's properly mobilized. And I believe that it can only overcome pressure groups and, particularly, the minority pressure groups that exert their influence constantly on Congress—it can only come about by the development of an informed public opinion.

Man: Senator Long, wouldn't a certain amount of information given the enemy be an excellent way to prevent aggression—that is, making the enemy afraid?

Senator Long: In some respects it can. On the other hand, in some respects it gives the enemy certainty of our weaknesses when he might be in doubt as to just what would be the danger that he would undertake. In many respects, the enemy does know what our

capabilities are, but it would be a mistake for us to let him know it for certain.

Man: Congressman Armstrong, the President is the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy under the Constitution. What authority is there for such a hearing as the MacArthur hearing, in particular?

Congressman Armstrong: Well, the President as Commander-in-Chief of the armed services of this country has the right to dispose a general, or place him here or there. No one has disputed the right of President Truman to fire General MacArthur, of course. I was with General MacArthur just a few days before he was fired, and after he was fired I talked to him, and it seemed to me a very lamentable thing that a President would see fit to kick out a General of the stature of General MacArthur without some consultation. Now as to the right of Congress to investigate the matter, my friend, Congress can investigate anything under the sun, whether anything comes of it or not. *(Laughter)*

Man: Senator Long, to what extent are the normal operations of Congress impaired by extended congressional investigations?

Senator Long: Sometimes they are very greatly impaired. Many times during the MacArthur hearings we had more people in the MacArthur hearing than we had on the floor of the Senate. Sometimes we had as much as five times as many in the MacArthur hearing as there were on the floor.

Lady: Congressman Armstrong, do you favor Senator Hunt's resolution to repeal constitutional im-

munity granted congressmen for statements made in conduct of congressional hearings?

Congressman Armstrong: No, I do not favor that, but I do favor members of Congress of both houses using a little more discretion.

Man: Senator Long, if we start withholding any information from the public as a national policy, where will it stop?

Senator Long: I might answer that by referring to what actually happened in World War II. We Americans like to criticize ourselves and low-rate ourselves, but we've never lost a war. In World War II, many of our committees never released one single bit of information that concerned a military item, and they were never criticized for that. In all probability, they very properly did so. As a matter of fact, if our enemies had had the chance to make the study that the appropriations committee made of the military items going through, they would have undoubtedly found that we were building the atom bomb and how much we were spending on it during that war.

Man: Senator Long, do not the investigations introduce our allies to American psychology which they need to know and understand?

Senator Long: That's very true, and sometimes it's to our disadvantage. General Marshall stated during the course of those investigations, when he was asked what the Russians were planning or what the Russians had in mind: "I only wish that I had what the Russians are getting from me now, when they have the opportunity to know what I'm thinking and what I think they think." We don't have anything like that. The Rus-

sians keep that all secret. That's why they do have some advantages over us.

Man: Congressman Armstrong, would not South Korea have been overrun,* as Russia planned, if we had waited to debate publicly whether to help her the way we have debated MacArthur's dismissal?

Congressman Armstrong: Yes, I think so. And I think it makes it all the more sad that we announced months ago that we were not going to defend Korea. If we intended to send our boys in there to fight and die for Korea, we certainly shouldn't have said that and we shouldn't have pulled our boys out.

And furthermore the Constitution gives to Congress and to Congress alone the power to declare war. After the Commander-in-Chief had sent those boys into Korea, if he intended to send them into war, he ought to have asked Congress to declare it.

Lady: Senator Long, what effect have these hearings had on our Latin American neighbors?

Senator Long: So far as I know they have had no other effect than to convince our Latin American neighbors, as well as the rest of the world, that we had no aggressive designs upon anyone, and all we sought was world peace.

Lady: Congressman Armstrong, did not the recent investigation lower itself to such a muddy level that it was detrimental to whatever belief the American people have left in their government?

Congressman Armstrong: With all due respect to the lady, I don't think it lowered itself to a muddy level. There were some questions brought out that perhaps might have been omitted, but after all,

in a question so controversial as the firing of General MacArthur, it was to be expected that there would be sharp differences of opinion. I think, and this may be rather queer for a member of the House of Representatives to say about the Senate, but my hat's off to the Senate. I think they did a swell job.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator Long, stand up and bow, please.

Man: Senator Long, do you not think that sometimes our security is endangered in these congressional hearings by interrogators resorting to character assassination by the use of insinuation and innuendoes in these hearings?

Senator Long: I don't believe that that necessarily endangers our national security, but it doesn't help our government as a whole. We have too much of that today. I wish we could reduce it.

Man: Congressman Armstrong, where there is no opportunity to be faced by accusers, and no cross-examination of witnesses, are our inalienable rights being endangered?

Congressman Armstrong: Yes, I think they would be, but I don't believe the gentleman would contend that in congressional hearings set up to obtain facts anyone is being accused of anything. The Congressional Committee, either in Senate or House, is not acting as a judge and a jury and a prosecutor, but rather as a fact-finding body. Yes, I would be with you and with every American in our desire to preserve the right of the individual against undue prosecution.

Lady: Senator Long, isn't it only fair to our men who are honest public officials to expose those who

would put selfish interests above patriotism?

Senator Long: Yes, it is, but it's oftentimes very difficult. I might give you an example. We had the issue come before us of whether we were going to release the confidential document that advised the State Department employees that the fall of Formosa was imminent, and they should prepare to explain to the world that Formosa was not essential to us to keep us from losing too much face in the Far East. That was not really what our State Department thought the strategic value of Korea to be. Now there was a document that was of value to the Kremlin and the Republican party, so we had to release that document.

Mr. Denny: Congressman Armstrong is on his feet.

Congressman Armstrong: Yes, I'm happy to respond to that one. If, as the Senator says, and as Dean Acheson himself says, that in that statement he was saying something that was not strictly true, then the only value the Kremlin could get out of that was the hope that we were becoming more and more like the Russians in our false propaganda.

Man: Senator Long, do you not think that the MacArthur investigation caused Congress to assert its rights as a coordinate civil branch of the government as charged under the Constitution?

Senator Long: Yes, I believe Congress properly asserted its rights in those hearings. Many times the people of this Nation want to know what the facts are and what is going on, and even though in some cases it does mean that we are forced to give out certain secrets that do in some respects help our enemies, it's im-

portant enough to this democracy that all the people be able to participate in it and form their opinions so that we can go forward together, and we certainly should have had such an investigation, regardless of who liked it and who didn't like it.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator. We're making some kind of record tonight with so many questions from this audience, but our interrogators are on the edges of the seats now, and there is Dr. Cole with a question.

Dr. Cole: Congressman Armstrong, I'm not at all satisfied with what you said a while ago. A congressional committee is a judge, a jury, and a prosecutor all at the same time. I believe that you remarked a few minutes ago that that wasn't the case. How would you come to that conclusion?

Congressman Armstrong: Well, Dr. Cole, I don't like to differ with so eminent an authority as yourself, a college president, but I don't think that a congressional committee holding a hearing, and certainly not an open hearing, could be considered a judge, or a jury, or a prosecutor. They are not trying anyone. If they find facts, that indicates that someone should be prosecuted, it is my understanding that it is the duty of that committee to turn those facts over to a grand jury and to proceed in the proper manner. I do not know of anyone being sentenced by a congressional committee unless that person has been in contempt of the committee. No, they are simply fact finders.

Mr. Denny: Wait a minute, Congressman, both of these interrogators are after you now.

Mr. Merrill: I'd like to ask Congressman Armstrong a leading

question, first, and then shift to Senator Long. Isn't it a fact that the defaultation of Alger Hiss was first exposed in an open congressional hearing?

Congressman Armstrong: Yes, and it was exposed after the President said something about a red herring. I think that investigation did a whole lot to uncover a lot that needed uncovering in our State Department.

Mr. Merrill: And now to continue the question to Senator Long, why be so concerned with what Russia may find out about our foreign policy through congressional hearings when the State Department has agents of Russia and communist sympathizers in places of authority within the department? *(Applause)*

Senator Long: I would like to say that that is a statement that the record does not prove. Senator McCarthy charged that he had the names of 200 communists in the State Department. He was given the opportunity to prove it. He was given the F.B.I. files which he said would prove it. He was given every opportunity and the help of the Republican National Committee and didn't prove a single one of them to be a communist. *(Applause)* Just to be fair about it and tell the whole story, Senator McCarthy had the right of smearing those people on the floor of the Senate, and not one of them to this day has a right to sue him for a single red copper cent for having their reputations destroyed.

Now, it's true that Alger Hiss was found to be giving out secret information of his Government. Alger Hiss was a traitor to this Government, in my opinion, but let's let the whole record stand

that Alger Hiss was giving secrets to Russia prior to the time that Russia became our enemy.

Mr. Denny: All right, I won't press that matter, Mr. Merrill, to ask if you want to name anybody, because you might involve us as well as yourself in a suit, so we'll take the question from the next gentleman in the audience.

Man: Congressman Armstrong, haven't personalities overshadowed some of the main issues of our great debate?

Congressman Armstrong: Yes, I think so and I think that's inevitable when you have personalities as outstanding as there were in this great debate, including the President, General MacArthur, the Senators, Chiefs of Staff, and others. They were great men and they were great personalities.

Man: Congressman Armstrong, aren't closed congressional hearings the first step in the abdication of the principle of freedom of the press?

Congressman Armstrong: I think they are in the democratic tradition. They bring out the facts and no one should be fearful of the facts. I think they are squarely in line with what we need. I think they are very much in line with what we are having here tonight.

Man: Congressman Armstrong, if it is so desirable, and I believe it is, that we should send grist to the Russian mill, why did Congress cut down the appropriation of the Voice of America?

Congressman Armstrong: Well, that's a good question, and of course I can't speak for my colleagues. I myself very much favor the Voice of America. I would step it up a hundredfold, not perhaps all by government funds, but I think our churches, our schools, our business groups, the League of Women Voters, and all ought to get into this thing and send the truth to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Lady: Congressman Armstrong, does not all this bickering and name-calling between the different branches of our government make us appear more like adolescents to our allies than world leaders?

Congressman Armstrong: Well, I'm inclined to agree with you, and perhaps it is time that we all grew up a little more. And I think open discussions like this and congressional hearings will help us do the job.

Mr. Denny: Well, thank you very much Congressman Armstrong, Senator Long, Walter Merrill, and this very fine audience, and our thanks too to our host, Dr. Houston Cole, President of Jacksonville State College, who also served as an interrogator here tonight, and Colonel Harry Ayers, publisher of the *Anniston Star*, and Mr. Malcolm Street of station WHMA.

So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.

THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

"IS THE WEST FINISHED IN ASIA?"

Program of June 26, 1951

Speakers

John C. Caldwell

Soedarpo Sastrosatomo

James A. Michener



Each week we print as many significant comments on the preceding Tuesday's broadcast as space allows. You are invited to send in your opinions, pro and con, not later than Thursday following the program. It is understood that we may publish any letters or comments received.



TIME AND PATIENCE

Western people are not inherently "better" than Asians, but a culture has developed among them which is in most respects superior to the cultures of Asia and is therefore spreading to (Asia). This spread is being guided with sympathy and due modesty by the more high-minded Westerners, who also realize that Western culture may be enriched by very many things that Asia has to offer; but arrogantly and with an eye to personal profit by others who ignorantly imagine that superiority in culture means superiority in virtue. Contact of the former results in mutual understanding and solid friendship; contact of the latter breeds friction and sooner or later hatred.

In the relatively backward Asian countries there is an inevitable and justifiable desire for self-expression which usually takes the form of nationalistic movements, and some of the leaders in such movements are far-seeing and unselfish, but others . . . use them for personal advancement. It is to their interest to encourage hatred of outsiders and particularly of Westerners in order to obtain

power as "patriots" and afterwards retain it by distracting attention from the shortcomings of their own regimes . . . The star example today is of course Communist Russia. There being but one party under Communism, it must answer for its failures unless blame can be saddled upon some other body, usually a foreign nation or group of nations, and it is essential to build up the image of this "devil" in the minds of its people as a means of protection from its people. Hostility to outside nations by the Comintern is, I believe, less desire for war beyond Russian borders than survival within them, and that hostility to the West in Asia where it exists . . . has the same basis. Its cure will be found in patience, careful behavior on the part of representatives of Western nations, and time in which to allow the Dead Sea fruits of totalitarian governments to turn to ashes on the lips of those who try them.—JOHN R. SWANTON, Newton, Massachusetts.

WHAT ELSE MUST WE DO?

I would like to know how many millions, perhaps billions, of dollars must we taxpayers give

and how many thousands of American lives must be sacrificed before we can be considered generous and helpful people by the Asians? After all, we can't be expected to protect, help, and raise the standard of living for the entire world—Europe, Asia, South America, and Africa. We still have 150 million Americans who deserve consideration. What have we got to do to be "nice"?—FLORENCE D. WATKINS, Cockeysville, Maryland.

INDONESIAN PROGRESS

Having been myself a missionary in Java some years ago, I feel I must write out of the fullness of pride I felt for (Mr. Soedarpo). Without question he was the real statesman of the group. His viewpoint, his vision, his broad-mindedness, represent a wisdom and ability on the part of his people, which is worthy of our high respect and confidence, and of our help.

Knowing and loving the Indonesian people as I have for many years, I would say . . . (that they) are naturally a gentle, friendly and most lovable people. We who know these charming folk and their wonderful, beautiful archipelago are eagerly and solicitously watching—desiring to help—them in their amazing progress toward modern independence and development.—MRS. W. G. SHELLABEAR, Hartford, Connecticut.

RELIGION AND MORALS

I was heartily in accord with (Mr. Soedarpo) about America wanting to go into his country and insisting that they accept our morals and religion. Who are we to say that other nations' morals and religions are wrong? We believe . . . what we are taught in religion and (so do the Asians) . . . We are so ready to criticize and condemn others in this world when we have all we can do to keep our own houses clean, morally and religiously. We have our good and bad as all other nations.—HELEN C. TRIPPSTEIN, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

(If we) let the Oriental live as he sees fit, help him when possible, but do not try to dominate his way of life, we will get along much better with him. I know quite a few Chinese and Japanese who are citizens of this country and have found from my talks with them that they want to live their own way and are willing to let us live ours.—A. D. WICK, Portland, Oregon.

We will have to win (Asia's) friendship, but I do not think it can be done by trying to make them accept our religion. Why haven't we sense enough to follow the old advice, "Put yourself in his place?" — ALICE HARMAN, Whiting, Iowa.